



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/020,712 | 12/11/2001 | Mark Paine | 9623/378 | 1404 |

56020 7590 09/26/2006

BRINKS HOFFER GILSON & LIONE / YAHOO! OVERTURE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/020,712 | Applicant(s) PAINE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Etienne P. LeRoux | Art Unit 2161 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Etienne P. LeRoux. (3) _____
 (2) John G Rauch. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 September 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 66.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ryan.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that examiner was incorrectly interpreting the claim 66 limitation "a new information provider." Examiner countered that since no explicit definition was provided in the specification, the PTO requires claim language to be given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

EP LeRoux 9/20/06
 Examiner's signature, if required